



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tend a broader field. A state of war wherever it exists implies universal harm and far-reaching misery.

But the principle that depressed conditions in one state cannot fail to induce similar conditions in another and that warfare does not assert its evils in only those communities in which it is waged, is shown in other considerations. The uncertainties of war must ever operate in this direction. A turn in diplomatic negotiation, the outcome of a single battle, or the expressed opinion of a minister of state, may change the face of affairs so completely as to be wholly beyond human foresight and calculation. As long as no forecast can anticipate what changes may take place, men will not embark in those undertakings in which wealth is employed and accumulated. They shrink from risk and wisely await the result. Thus the mainsprings of a nation's prosperity — its capital and its resources — remain idle and undeveloped. Sudden changes precede the commencement of war, accompany its progress and follow its close, baffling the utmost precaution and unsettling the whole business structure.

They discourage progress, defeat the best plans and produce a forced lethargy throughout. Hence ensue a general derangement and stagnation in productive undertakings. Nearly all the departments of commercial enterprise are either thrown into confusion or brought entirely to a standstill, and the main energies of the people, even those not directly engaged, must either rust in idleness or be frittered away in baffled schemes and fruitless exertions.

It is a universally accepted economic doctrine, that each State, by reason of its climate, situation or other opportunities, has superior advantages in certain departments of production, manufacture, or trade, and that a State becomes rich and prosperous in proportion as it buys all things as cheaply as possible in respect of which it has not those advantages, and finds the greatest demand in other countries for the things which itself most economically produces or prepares. It is clear that war and all it pre-supposes, is diametrically opposed to these axioms of international trade. This is not the case merely because war springs out of, or is inflamed by, sentiments of personal rivalry and animosity between the citizens of different States, a fact incompatible with widespread trade relations, but because war in itself is fatal to the course of trade. It occasions interruptions, sudden, perplexing and incalculable; it forces ordinary trade into unnatural and uncongenial channels; it calls into existence an anomalous sort of trade, based on nothing but the artificial exigencies of war.

It is an encouraging sign that the people of Europe, who are groaning under the weight of war taxation even in times of peace, are beginning to understand the baneful effects of war from an economic standpoint and are, within constitutional limits, insisting upon a reduction of

appropriations for the maintenance of armies. Recent years have witnessed the dismissal of Cabinets and the downfall of Ministers of State because of their failure to receive the sanction of the people's representatives to an increase of taxation for military purposes. The example of settling difficulties by arbitration set before the eyes of the world by the United States of America has not failed of its fullest effect. The roar of the cannon is growing fainter and fainter in the distance of the past and in its stead is heard the approach of the chariot of universal peace in its onward course toward a higher and nobler future.

*College of the City of New York.*

### SHALL WE BUILD MORE WARSHIPS?

Speech delivered in the House of Representatives February 15th, on the naval appropriation bill.

BY HON. WILLIAM EVERETT OF MASS.

MR. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I feel, after the eloquent and thoughtful speech that we have just listened to from my friend from the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. MONEY], my honored associate in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that it is no easy task to reply to him or to anyone taking his side of this question.

I have never conquered the trepidation with which I arose the first time I addressed this House, and when I am to espouse a cause which is in many respects unpopular, which in many respects does not meet an echo in the hearts of my countrymen of any section, when I am to reply to such an admirable exposition of the cause of the increase of the Navy, I feel more than ordinarily doubtful of doing justice to myself or of impressing upon this House the views I would seek to.

I know how taking, how inspiring, how thrilling is the story of naval victories. I know how easy it is to make the cheeks glow and the eyes sparkle and the whole frame tingle by the story of naval prowess, from the time of Salamis to this very current year. I have done something in the way of reading and telling of those exploits to those who, I thought, would be excited over them. And if any of the gentlemen who favor the increase of the Navy would pay me enough for delivering a popular lecture on that subject, I think I could tell the story of naval prowess in ancient and in modern times, in foreign seas and in our own, in such a way that every boy in the United States would apply for a cadetship at Annapolis, if he had not applied for one already. [Laughter.]

But, sir, it is not the thrilling, it is not the inspiring, it is not the popular themes that it chiefly behooves a speaker here to address himself to. There is no difficulty in carrying away the American people by lofty sentiments. Sometimes we have to consider if there is not something else besides historic renown and what are considered lofty and elevating emotions.

I desire to ask the attention of the committee for a short time while I present what appears to me the objections to proposed increase of the battle ships of the American Navy, to some considerations founded on what may be deemed sordid and inferior grounds, and some considerations based, if I do not greatly mistake, on sentiments that are elevated even beyond martial renown, and have a power, if a man rightly receives them, to control him with a deeper emotion than even that of fighting for the honor of his country, elevated as that appears.

In the first place, sir, I wish the committee to consider this. The question is not whether we shall have a Navy, not whether we shall do something to arm ourselves for defence. It is whether this specific increase of three battle ships of the first class shall be provided for at the present time. It is whether in addition to the four first-class battle ships now in process of construction, we shall go on and provide for a still greater increase. I am not aware that anybody has proposed to destroy the Navy of the United States. I think in a Democratic House, if one wanted to take that ground, it might be well to remind some gentlemen that Mr. Jefferson sold off the little old Navy which had been constructed by John Adams. But I am not aware that anybody proposes that.

The question is, if we shall go ahead. The question is, if we shall begin to put our Navy in competition with the navies of the greater powers of the world. If I understood my friend from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] aright, that is the question before us. Now, sir, it will not be denied that it is a very expensive proposition. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] put it very well. The present Committee on Naval Affairs has very adroitly arranged this proposition so as to make it appear that the immediate expenditure is not to be serious. But we are going to lay the keel, if I may speak appropriately, for a considerable expenditure. We are going to discount the supposed surplus in the interest of an increasing Navy.

Now, sir, I am very willing to take the word, if you please, of the present Secretary of the Treasury that we are to have a surplus. I am willing and eager to believe that he tells the exact truth when he says that at the end of a specific time — at the end of this calendar year — he expects to see the revenue \$21,000,000 ahead of the expenditures. I am willing to suppose he has underrated it. I am willing to suppose that it will be \$25,000,000; but I would ask the gentleman, I would ask any member or members of the Committee on Appropriations, supposing we have that surplus, are there not drafts which are going to be made upon it to a degree that render indulgence in expensive luxuries a very serious and doubtful matter?

In the first place, I want to see our honest debts paid. I do not want to have claimants remain unpaid who have just claims on the Treasury of the United States, and

whose claims have been allowed by the tribunal to which we refer those claims. I do not want successful pleaders before the Court of Claims to come in here year after year and session after session knocking at our doors and be told by the Committee on Appropriations that there is no money to pay claims that have in many instances been due for years, some for generations, and some for a century; that we are taking the money to build up a navy to protect our commerce and can not pay them for our commerce that was destroyed between 1798 and 1800 by the cruisers of the French Revolutionary navy, and that the great-great-grandchildren of the men who lost those ships are here waiting for justice from the American Congress, and their claims are to be postponed until we have built some more ships with a possibility of having to protect our commerce in the future.

Then, sir, when we have paid all our just claims, when every claim that has been reported from the Court of Claims and from the Committee on Claims—and the chairman is before me—and from the Committee on War Claims (and they never report any but perfectly just claims which ought to be paid immediately), when all these debts have been paid, to come to the expenditures of home, to the expenditures that our citizens need to have made to keep them in peace and prosperity—I think, sir, for instance, the first thing that comes into my mind is the grossly inadequate salaries that are paid the higher officials. The gentleman from Mississippi wants us to compete with foreign nations. He wants us to expend money on our Navy and our national defence on a scale worthy of the greatest and richest nation on the earth and something like what is expended by Great Britain, by France, by the German Empire, and by Austria-Hungary.

Does he think of what an unworthy spectacle our foreign ministers present when they go to reside in those countries? Does he consider what grossly inadequate salaries are received by our public men, by our Cabinet officers, by our judges, so that you can hardly get a first-rate lawyer to take a judicial place on account of the miserable pittance that our judges receive? I think of our post-office, I think of how the Government of Great Britain carries his letters and his parcels to every man's door, and I think how far behind we are in that respect with all our boasted progress.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that we are unable to get first-rate lawyers to take judicial positions.

Mr. EVERETT. That is my idea.

Mr. DINGLEY. So far as I have heard in this House and elsewhere, there has been no difficulty in getting first-rate lawyers to accept judicial positions when tendered to them. [Laughter.]

Mr. EVERETT. Well, I would say to the gentleman from Maine that I constantly hear the exact opposite from members of the bar.

Mr. DINGLEY. That must be a mistake, judging from what I have seen and heard here.

Mr. EVERETT. Well, I hear one way and the gentleman from Maine hears another way.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. The gentleman is not responsible for what he hears.

Mr. EVERETT. Neither am I.

Mr. HULICK. I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that after the 4th of March there will be many good lawyers out of business. [Laughter.]

Mr. EVERETT. Does the gentleman from Ohio think that our judicial salaries are adequate? Mr. Chairman, I think of the things I have mentioned, and further, I would raise the question which is familiar to all gentlemen here, of the state of our public buildings throughout the country. I would raise the question which constantly comes up before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the question of the need, the absolute need, of what some people absurdly speak of as "steals," the absolute need of erecting at proper points all over the country public buildings suited to the requirements of a people like ours.

Why, sir, I took pleasure the other day in voting for a new post-office at Chicago. I voted for a building there that was estimated to cost \$4,000,000. I was ready to speak for that bill, but Chicago never needs anyone to speak for her or in praise of her; she is always able to blow her own trumpet just as loud as there is need of at any given time. [Laughter.] But, Mr. Chairman, I felt that that was a great public necessity. I feel now that if we are to have a surplus that is the kind of object that our money should be spent for. Do you tell me that that building was for the city of Chicago alone? Not a bit of it!

Every city in the country, every village in the country, from Houlton down to Galveston and off to Tacoma in the West, is interested in having the letters go through the Chicago post-office safely and speedily. Chicago is one of the great central organs of the entire country. I do not know that I can call it the heart of the country; I do not know that I can call it the head of the country; I do not know that I can call it the stomach of the country; but I may be entitled to call Chicago the liver of the country, through which there passes a great circulation which converts all the things we swallow into sugar for the benefit of the body politic. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, I say that for all these needs and for other needs the surplus, if there is one, would be discounted over and over again. Think of the Indians. Think of what they call for. The starving Navajoes called for \$25,000 the other day and there was a doubt as to whether it should be given to them; and yet we have money to build warships! I think of the fact that this naval appropriation bill proposes to make appropriations above the estimates, while, if I am not mistaken, every other

appropriation bill, except the agricultural bill, goes under the estimates. When you have raised those other bills to the level of the estimates of the Cabinet officers and Departments, then we can see about discounting the surplus on any one bill and going beyond or above the estimates.

Now, sir, if we mean anything by economy this is the place to practise it; and let me say just here that I give my Republican friends as much credit for wishing real economy as I do my Democratic friends. I do not believe there is any man here who will vote for an expenditure that he has not some good reason for voting for, and I believe that generous and liberal expenditure as well as economy is a right principle upon which the representatives of a great nation ought to act. [Applause.] But why do I name these appropriations and these claims as being more deserving than that of the battle ships? Why do I think that the full recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior should be carried out in the appropriation bills rather than those of the Secretary of the Navy?

I will try to say, Mr. Chairman, and herein I know that I am going to trench upon somewhat delicate ground; I know that in what I am about to say now I take some risk of touching the feeling of some of my friends on both sides of the House, and I entreat every gentleman who hears me, I entreat all those who love their country, to believe that in what I am going to say I am actuated by as keen patriotism and as high appreciation of personal distinction as any gentleman that sits before me here.

There is nothing, Mr. Chairman, by which you can arouse men to excitement more easily than by words of military glory and fighting for the renown of the flag. I see on each side of me men of whose personal acquaintance I am proud, whom I feel honored by knowing, men who have distinguished themselves in war on land and sea. I see men before me and around me who have proved in the strongest way in which men can prove it that they are afraid of no exposure, of no danger, of no suffering—who, if God so willed, would have met death itself for the honor, as they believed, of their country, and the flag and the truth.

I know that in every generation of the world there have been brave men who have been ready to fight and suffer and die for their country. And I know how that thought makes men excited and emulous so that they believe there is nothing greater in the world than a war in behalf of what is esteemed a just cause. That has been the way in times past; it is to a great extent the way in the present. But here I stand to say, if I am the only man on the floor to say it—here I say, if I knew it would make me distrusted and laughed at in the House; here I say, if I

CONTINUED ON PAGE 66.

to enter it. But, instead of it, both England and America concluded to furnish the great French nation improved arms for the better success in killing Germans. The United States government even set Americans at work to manufacture the cartridges necessary for this purpose, and large shipments were made directly to France.

I am not raising here an international question. I know that we were safe under the rules of international law. But we should be candid enough to recognize this fact: that nothing was done by any of the great neutral powers to prevent that war. When it was ended, the line of the Vosges mountains, and Metz and Strassburg, were claimed by Germany for better defence against a repetition of such a war.

When this cession was made, did Europe enter a protest, stating that the civilized nations of the world would protect Germany from another invasion on the part of France, and, perchance, of Russia at the same time? Was not Germany left to her own resources? After the enormous sacrifices made, who would blame her for securing herself?

This is the question of Alsace-Lorraine, all the rest is mere by-work!

Whether or not 1,500,000 Alsace-Lorrainers are under German or French rule makes very little difference. The one government is as good as the other, and the vast majority of the people care very little about any government. They want to be let alone. It is claimed that they are less interfered with under German rule than they were under French. However this may be, the young generation has had twenty-four years of German schooling, and it is more than likely that all those born in the last quarter of a century consider themselves good Germans, with only such scattering exceptions as are found anywhere.

If Europe and America seriously wish to settle the Alsace-Lorraine question, *they must begin by giving absolute security to Germany as to the impossibility of another French invasion!* I believe that it can be shown that nothing now keeps France from a new war with Germany except the Triple Alliance.

This fact no one more sincerely regrets than I do, but that it is a fact I have every reason to believe. The colossal armaments of France prove this. The constant espionage of French officers in Germany proves this. No German officer has ever been convicted of espionage in France, nor any German whomsoever. But the courts of Germany have repeatedly tried before juries cases of such flagrant espionage that no one can deny the fact of its existence. The leading military paper of France states unblushingly that the next war will begin by an overwhelming invasion *without previous declaration of war*. I regret very much that Mr. Frederick Passy is in such a hopeless minority in France, but that he is in a minority, no one can doubt.

One word about the patois of Alsace. It is closely allied to the language of Baden, on the east bank of the Rhine. It is purely German, as much so as any other dialect of Germany, in spite of a slight admixture of French words which, for the most part, are also found in other German dialects. Those who speak French with ease are in a small minority. Alsace is not nearly as French as, for instance, Chicago is German. The French element in both Alsace and Lorraine is not much over fifteen per cent. of the whole population.

I sincerely hope that the friends of peace will finally cause the civilized world at large to unite and act as an arbiter of the peace of the whole world, but until this end is accomplished, Alsace-Lorraine must remain the bulwark that protects Germany against a new invasion by France.

C. A. EGGERT.

*Vanderbilt University, Nashville.*

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 59.

knew that every man, woman and child in my own old State, the State of naval glory, would be against me—there is something greater than renown in war; there is something better than dying for your country, and that is living for it.

It belongs to the past, it belongs to barbarous ages, it belongs to a bygone and effete civilization, it belongs to the system of Europe, it does not belong to us to look forward and contemplate and reason and count the chances of war. We hear those terrible words—"in case of war,"—"in the event of war." The report of the gallant Secretary of the Navy, the report of my gallant friends, both the majority and the minority of the Naval Committee—their reports and recommendations ring with such words. It is that old war fever. It is allowing one's self to contemplate the possibility, the danger, and the horror of having to fight for your country. Oh, yes, we can fight for it—no men better in the world. I know it. We have proved it; and we need not prove it again. But we have a better destiny before us.

Allow the European nations to make their great war preparations. Allow Italy to plunge herself into bankruptcy with her Triple Alliance. Allow Russia to raise loan after loan from an impoverished people. Allow the spirit of Bismarck and Von Moltke still to dominate in Prussia. Allow England to pile up her 43 warships. Allow France to nourish the temper of Boulanger in her bosom. But not for the United States are such things. Oh, no! We can settle our differences otherwise. We can withhold all unjust claims. We can put ourselves in such a position with other nations that we need not increase our Navy.

We have a Navy. I do not seek to destroy it. Keep it and man it. Possibly in times when we have a surplus—an undoubted surplus, a big surplus [laughter]—possibly at a time when we need not be raising gold loans at 4 per cent. or even at 3½ per cent.—possibly at a time when all is peaceful and easy in our cities, we may then amuse ourselves with building more battle ships as pretty but expensive toys. But when we are taken out of the war system of European nations; when we have entered upon the new and glorious destiny of the future; when we have put behind us all this ancient history; when the course of our peaceful empire is taking its way westward, do not let us turn our eyes backward; do not let us be conjuring up old needless fears.

I see before me, as I say, men who have fought bravely and have learned each other's prowess. I would appeal to the old soldiers here, if there is any greater horror than war; if there is anything that kills off what a nation would sooner keep and save, is it not war?

Oh, Mr. Chairman, I know how I shall be answered. I can tell almost in advance the number of eloquent men, the number of witty men, the number of popular men here who can rise, if they will, when I get through, and can pour upon me, if they choose, charges of not maintaining

the honor of "the old flag." "The old flag" will maintain its own honor. "The old flag" never can be disgraced and never can be humiliated. The nations of the world are not in danger of insulting it simply because we have declined to put three new battle ships on our list of the Navy.

Yes, there is a foreign enemy. There is an enemy lying in wait for us that is not American. But that enemy is not in Great Britain or France; it is not in Austria or Chile. That enemy, that foreign enemy, that un-American enemy is in our great cities. The foreign enemy that we have to dread is planted in the streets of our great cities—your city and mine. There it is festering; there it is seething; there it is threatening destruction to American institutions far greater and more speedy than any thunders that the *Majestic* could hurl against us when she shall make her trial trip next August. There is the problem for us. There is what demands the expenditure of our surplus.

There is where we have to work in order to bring about prosperity in our country. We have got to train, to educate, to guard, to raise, to assimilate that population in our great cities, and it is from them and not from the enemy outside of our borders that we have anything to fear.

When I was a boy, Mr. Chairman, I was eager as any boy could be to read of wars and of military glory. There was no boy in the schools of Cambridge or Boston that could be stirred to excitement sooner than I by reading the history of some mighty victory from Marathon to Waterloo. At that time, when but 10½ years old, and with a mind stored more than most of boys of that age, as I read those exciting and inspiring stories I read the lines written by one of our own poets, which I thought then were false; lines that, as boys will do, feeling as I did toward them, I marked with pencil marks in my reader as worthy of reprobation and condemnation, for I thought them silly; but I know now they are true. I know now that those words of the poet Longfellow, describing the arsenal at Springfield—calling on every nation to stop in its career of piling up armaments, to stop its miserable game of beggar my neighbor to see what nation should frighten the other the most—I know that those words are true.

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,  
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts  
Given to redeem the human mind from error,  
There were no need of arsenals nor forts;  
The warrior's name would be a name abhorred,  
And every nation that should lift again  
Its hand against a brother, on its forehead  
Would wear forevermore the curse of Cain.

You say let them begin first. You say we can not disarm until they do. I say no! We can. I say it is with us to lead the van. It is with us to begin; it is with us to announce to the nations of the world, that are still quivering under the reign of the effete notions of antiquity, "here we stand in our ancient renown, that needs no vindication: in our justice, in our moderation, prepared to submit to peaceable arbitration every question between ourselves and our brethren, and you may go on in your game of war—you may go on and construct your iron-clads, increase your artillery and infantry and musketry—the United States is too great, too noble, too modern to sink herself to the level of the military notions of the ancient world." [Prolonged applause.]

## THE MAGAZINES AND PAPERS.

### THE INDEPENDENT.

It needed no prophet to foresee that the strike of the Brooklyn trolley men would speedily run its course. It has lasted about two weeks, and what is the net result? It has cost the city thousands of dollars; it has required the marshaling of several regiments of State militia at great expense; it has almost suspended intercourse between different parts of the city at a loss which no man can estimate; it has deprived the employes of two weeks or more of wages; it has deprived the companies of two weeks of income and subjected them to losses by injury to their lines; it has resulted indirectly in the destruction of much valuable property and not a little bloodshed. The companies are poorer, the employes are poorer, the community is poorer. It is idle in the face of such an outcome as this to discuss the question whether the companies or the men have gained the advantage. Most of the men probably will be back soon in their old positions. That has been the course in previous strikes. They are skilled men and the companies know that they can trust them better than new men. They may have gained some little consideration from the companies, but not much. The companies may be said to have vindicated the right to manage their own property, but this they have done after all at the expense of the city and the State. The worst of it is that we have apparently come no nearer to a solution of such difficulties than before. No new principle has been developed out of the conflict, and there seems to be no reason to believe that similar conflicts will not take place in the future. It seems to us that both the men and the companies have been short-sighted. The companies might have shown a more conciliatory spirit; the men might have used the newspapers beforehand to set their grievances before the public and got the sympathy of the public with them and so brought a lever to bear upon the companies. Their interests are mutual, but they seem to forget it. More kindness on the part of employers and more consideration on the part of employes would go a long way to prevent such conflicts. At present we know of nothing better.

### NEW YORK TRIBUNE.

#### Rome and Athens.]

It is a strange coincidence that Rome and Athens, which years ago furnished an illustration of the advantages of the arts of peace, occupying the vanguard of progress, enlightenment and civilization, should to-day offer an example to mankind of the evils of the arts of war. For, if Italy and Greece are at the present moment in the throes of political crises, of such gravity as to imperil the existence of their respective thrones, it is entirely due to financial straits caused by military and naval expenditure altogether out of proportion to the means of the treasury and of the taxpayer. In the Eternal City Prime Minister Crispi has been compelled to prorogue the Legislature, and to make preparations for another appeal to the country; while in the Hellenic capital the Cabinet has just resigned because of King George's refusal to permit Premier Tricoupis to adopt a similar course. At Rome, as at Athens, the dissolution of Parliament is regarded by many as the only means of solving the deadlock created by the refusal of the Chambers to vote the funds needed to carry on the administration of Govern-